

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAR 17 1913
MICH.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1913

No. 19

In answer to questions, I should state that Mr. Staples's list of 2000 practical Latin words, which was referred to in the last two editorials, was prepared under the auspices of the Department of Pedagogy of the University of Pennsylvania, *not* under those of the Department of Classical Philology.

G. L.

During the Thanksgiving recess there were several meetings of interest to classical teachers. That of The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland was announced in these columns (6.49). The chief paper, read by Principal J. H. Denbigh, will soon appear in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. During the same period the Association of Eastern Ohio held a meeting at Pittsburgh, where the chief topic was the Direct Method. Miss Anna Petty brought before the meeting a class of children who had never studied Latin at all, and gave an introductory lesson according to the principles of this method, arousing a very great deal of interest. Some time later a teacher whose name I regret to have overlooked made the same kind of a demonstration at Harrisburg, and a column of sympathetic discussion was accorded it in one of the Harrisburg daily papers, and the work along the new lines was highly commended. I am reminded by these events of an editorial in the Springfield Republican of August 16, 1912, regarding the work of Dr. Rouse at Columbia University. Some of the remarks in this editorial are worth quoting whether we agree with the statements or not. After reminding us that the method is not really new but is in reality but a return to earlier usage the writer continues:

A generation ago the oral or "direct" method would have had scant chance of acceptance in England or the United States, both because the teaching of modern languages was at a low ebb, and still more because a peculiar disciplinary value was attached to learning the Classics in a way which made them as difficult as possible. The faculties provided by Nature for learning languages instinctively and with little effort were disdainfully rejected. The help of tongue, ear, association with daily life was discarded, for these were but base and humble faculties such as the vulgar employ in picking up tongues. Instead, the whole work was put upon the intellect in the narrower sense, regardless of whether this were best adapted to the purpose or not. A carefully prescribed routine of grammatical drill was adopted, there was much slow and painful translation with the constant help

of a dictionary, and much wretched writing of Latin prose and even Latin verse. Industrious students with minds naturally adapted to this puzzle work became brilliant classical scholars, after the waste of not a little time in doing things wrong; the average pupil had many switchings for bad grammar and false quantities and left school with a feeble smattering of the Classics which he proceeded promptly to forget.

But now the disciplinary theory has been so far discredited that one will seldom find a teacher of authority openly maintaining that language study is more valuable for being made needlessly difficult so as to afford the growing mind a stiff gymnastic. On the other hand, the disparagement of the Classics common a few years ago is steadily diminishing, and educational opinion increasingly favors Latin and Greek as well, provided they can be learned with such mastery as to give them real cultural value. The chief criticism of Latin, as taught on a large scale in the secondary schools of America where Greek has nearly dropped out, is that the great majority get but a useless smattering in return for an expenditure of time sufficient to learn something worth while. So the way is fully open for such a radical and important reform in teaching as Dr. Rouse has brought over from England.

That the method is feasible is a matter of course; it would be strange if any expert teacher of languages could doubt it for a moment. Latin is after all but a language like another, and the same principles hold good for all. Moreover, the Renaissance and modern times as well are full of examples of the successful teaching of Latin as a spoken tongue. The one reason for skepticism, and for the moment a valid reason, is doubt as to the supply of competent teachers. The ordinary Latin teacher in this country is fairly well grounded in the theory of the language but has no practical mastery of it. The grammar he has studied faithfully, the small range of texts needed he knows well, he is often a specialist in some field of philology, and has well earned a degree. But his vocabulary is limited, he writes Latin with difficulty, even if with conventional correctness, and he cannot speak it at all. To conduct classes in the fashion illustrated by Dr. Rouse would be far beyond the powers of most teachers, even in the better schools, and the instructors in smaller high schools to whom Latin is often but one of several subjects, would be quite helpless.

It is plain that the reform must begin at the top, in the training of teachers, yet this is no ground for discouragement. Anyone who has learned a language thoroughly even by bookish methods can by a moderate amount of discipline acquire some facility in speaking it—within a narrow range. And a narrow range will suffice very well for elementary exercises and conversations. The ease of utterance and correctness of accent and idiom which are expected

of a good teacher of a modern language are by no means indispensable in Latin, not only because there are no rigid standards of right such as obtain in a living tongue, but also because the purpose of this oral drill is not to make proficient speakers but to give a quick, easy and natural introduction to a language which will be mainly studied by reading the Classics. The old theory was that they were to be mentally translated as one went along, and as a consequence many good students have never reached the point of reading easily in the original without mental translation as they read French or German. But this must be the ideal of the reformed study of Latin, and it can be attained much more quickly and easily by the direct method as practised by Dr. Rouse.

G. L.

THE CLASSICS

In the present-day civilization, in which the bulk of energy is expended along the lines of material progress, in which there is the unmistakable inclination to express the value of every social force in terms of dollars and cents, in which the concrete products of industrial education appeal so forcibly to the eye, in which there is a marked tendency to convert so many of our institutions of learning into centers of vocational training, and in which time has become the scarcest of human possessions, it is no great wonder that those who advocate and support the higher culture are constantly called upon to show the value not only of the higher education as a whole, but also of the various courses included under this designation. No strong argument is required to convince those who take a strictly utilitarian view of educational courses that those branches which have a direct and obvious bearing upon life should be included in any scheme having for its purpose either secondary or higher training. But when we come to the consideration of the so-called humanistic subjects whose bearing upon making a living is by no means so obvious, but whose influence upon life and character is inestimable, it is well-nigh impossible to convince those of strong practical bent that such studies have any place at all in our modern scheme of education. To no other courses on the list of humanistic subjects does the latter statement apply with greater force than to those embracing a study of the Greek and the Latin languages and literatures.

It may not be out of place in a discussion of this kind to point out just why Greek and Latin have until recently held a leading position in our modern educational system. Only a small percentage of the students who have studied either or both of these languages ever take the trouble to find out why the Classics form such an important feature of their educational life; they accept the study of the ancient languages as a matter of fact, just as they accept other customs and conditions into which they are born. Our civilization is essentially European and the modern civilization of Europe is based upon that of Greece and Rome. As one writer says: "It is the essential relation which Greece and Rome have to

modern civilization which makes the study of their spirit so important in modern education". So, at the very beginning of the modern civilization, when many of the arts and most of the sciences were either in their infancy or not yet thought of, the Classics formed the bone and sinew of that important educational movement known as the Revival of Learning. The ancient civilization had come to its end in Italy; in Italy the modern civilization began. It was soon after the fall of Constantinople that many Greek scholars sought refuge in Italy and under the patronage of wealth became the teachers of all Europe. The first three Italian authors—Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch—all of whom had made a serious study of the Classics, paved the way for the early labors of those teachers who, in their efforts to collect manuscripts, to make translations and to establish libraries, received the indorsement and the support of several of the clergy. Enthusiastic pupils flocked from England, France, and Germany to listen to these Italian scholars and afterwards carried the seeds of this new culture to their own countries beyond the Alps. In this way the study of Greek became a part of the higher educational scheme of all the leading countries of Europe. The Universities not only made it a part of their curricula, but for a long time regarded all other subjects as being important only in proportion to their relation to the Greek learning.

It is a well-known fact that the Latin language never ceased to be used even after the fall of the Roman civilization, but that, from that time on through the Middle Ages, it constituted the language of the Church, was the medium of all international intercourse, and the instrument for the expression of all higher thought. It became the language of the diplomat and of the scholar. All treatises on theology, law, science, criticism and philosophy were written in the language of Cicero and Livy. More than that, it was through the Latin and its literature that the scholars of the time were introduced into the life and the thought of the ancient world. It is not strange, then, that Latin, touching as it did the scholar and the man of affairs in so many points of their investigations and activities, should have become at the beginning of modern civilization a natural and necessary part of the higher learning. Until the middle part of the last century, the place of the classical languages in the higher education was unquestioned. All Christian nations had regarded them as the most valuable source of culture and as the indispensable equipment of the scholar, whether his investigations lay in the realm of science, literature or history. In fact there could be no higher education which did not embrace a study of the Classics.

The aim of education is to fit young men and women for the highest duties of citizenship and to make them useful members of society. How does a

study of the Classics assist in any way in the realization of this purpose?

The usual arguments offered in defense of the Classics are that Latin and Greek both in form and expression are the most finished languages known to the philologist and, therefore, afford discipline for the mind and training in exact expression. We are told, also, that the Classics because of their beauty of thought and expression have a decidedly cultural effect upon the mind. Still another argument, and one which has been urged with great effect, is, that for the expression of elevated thought and lofty sentiment, the English language depends almost entirely upon the Greek and the Latin.

No one who lays the slightest claim to discernment will hold that the classical languages as a mere linguistic acquisition, apart from the study of their spirit and meaning in civilization, would be of any great practical value; the value of the study of the ancient languages rests in investigating and assimilating, through the medium of these languages, the spirit, government, religion, and other sociological features of the nations who spoke them. Civilization is not a spontaneous, but a continuous, growth; as we look back over its history, it is clear that any particular stage of civilization represents the accumulation of successive stages of antecedent civilizations, and yet each stage has some individualizing characteristic. Even taking into consideration the modifications which have been made in the higher educational courses to suit the demands of the advocates of the non-humanistic subjects, it will be seen that the bulk of effort in the secondary and in the higher education is directed along humanistic lines. By humanistic studies we mean those studies whose subject matter is MAN as opposed to MATTER, "studies that concern themselves with the record of human motives, human thoughts, human aspirations, and human achievements". In other words, literature, history, and language have the largest claim on the time and effort of the students in the secondary and in the higher stages of culture. Higher education, then, is in large measure a study of civilization through one or all of these subjects—its purpose is not merely to examine the modern phases of civilization, but to trace them as they extend back and are rooted in the past.

Now let us see what nations of antiquity have made the largest contribution to our modern life. The completest answer to this question is to be found in the following statement taken from the report of the Committee of Ten on History:

The tasks that press upon us to-day were first recognized in Greece. Here man put before himself in definite shape the specific problems which he wills to solve. Here he marked out the bounds of government, art, philosophy, literature, science; formulated and tested their principles; saw and stated clearly their problems. The work of the European world was mapped out in Greece, and here direction was given to human effort, perhaps, forever.

Of the Roman contribution to civilization, the same report says:

Roman history is the great central ganglion by which the history of the world is connected; Rome handed down to us the civilization of Greece, gave us community of thought and ideals, rules us to-day in civil and ecclesiastical law. Hence Roman history lives in the present and must be taught.

The above statements very clearly indicate that there can be no genuine study of the problems of modern civilization until we have studied the character and spirit of those peoples with whom all the essential problems of our civilization originated. Greece stands first of all as the *center of beauty*, giving original impulse and direction to those forms which appeal to the highest qualities of the soul. Much that is most beautiful in literature and art, as well as the highest standards of culture and taste may be traced to the refining influence of the Greeks. The most finished literary productions of modern masters, whether they are English, German, French or Italian, are based upon Greek models. One finds it impossible, except in a superficial way, to enjoy, appreciate, and understand the finest productions of modern literature unless he is familiar with the Greek sources after which they are modelled. The spiritual turn given to physical phenomena by the vivid imagination of the Greeks, the deification and personification of physical forces and of natural objects, as well as of the passions and feelings of the human breast, the peopling of mountains, rivers, and forests with forms of life—all these form the basis of a richly figurative and poetic element in modern literature which contributes wonderfully to its beauty and without an acquaintance with which genuine appreciation is well-nigh out of the question. More than that, Greece has shown us the finest example of democratic government the world has ever seen. All governments which strive to give the greatest freedom to the individual and to protect him against the oppression of tyranny have in mind the brilliant example of ancient Greece, where the highest ideal of government was that the state should exist for the individual and not the individual for the state. The great problems of metaphysics which have since involved the human mind in the labyrinth of speculation were first comprehensibly stated by the subtlety and acuteness of the Greek mind. It does not exaggerate matters at all to say that it is impossible to estimate the value of the Roman contribution to our civilization, in the way of practical forms. If we are indebted to Greece for the finest moulds in almost every kind of art, we owe a greater debt to Rome for teaching us legal, ecclesiastical, and political forms. The Grecian civilization stood for beauty, the Roman for force; Greece showed what heights could be attained by the human intellect, and taught all of the nations which followed her the meaning of liberty. Rome showed what could be accomplished by irresistible force and how to govern

the nations by law; Greece left many models in art, in architecture, and in poetry, but Rome left to the great nations of Europe the models on which to form their three most substantial factors—language, laws, and religion. Every student of language readily recognizes in the French, the Spanish, and other Romance languages of Europe the modern perpetuation of the popular Latin in vocabulary, structure and often in form. The old Roman law forms the basis of the civil code for all the Latin races of Europe and America. The Roman Church governing the entire Catholic world by its vigorous and extensive ecclesiastical polity simply reflects the spirit and the methods of ancient political Rome. No one who recognizes the derivative character of our modern civilization will hesitate to grant that it is nothing short of imperative that students in the higher education whose duty it is to investigate the problems of art, literature, science, government, and philosophy should be well acquainted with the peoples who first attacked and in many cases most successfully solved these problems.

Now the question is whether such acquaintance can be secured through the medium of so-called translations and apart from the study of the Latin and the Greek languages. The experience of scholars, the testimony of educators, and the action of a discerning public justify us in answering this question emphatically in the negative. It is clear to every one who has studied these languages that the genius which produced them has everywhere impressed itself upon them. We admire the Greek for its grace and vigor, each reflecting to a marvelous degree the chief characteristics of the nation which produced it. It is only by coming into actual contact with the language that we imbibe the spirit and understand the former life of the people. There is, in fact, nothing that these great nations have left us which tells us so much about them as the image of themselves which they have stamped upon their languages.

The late Dr. William T. Harris, for many years U. S. Commissioner of Education and a recognized authority on pedagogic questions, even goes so far as to say that,

Of a hundred boys fifty of whom had studied Latin for a period of six months, while the other fifty had never studied Latin at all, the fifty with the smattering of Latin would possess some slight impulse toward analyzing the legal and political views of human life, and surpass the other fifty in this direction. Placed on a distant frontier, with the task of building a new civilization, the fifty with the smattering of Latin would furnish law makers and political rulers, legislators, and builders of the state.

The training which one receives in his own language from study of a foreign language, especially the Latin, can not be easily overestimated. The thought in any given passage of a foreign author must always be obtained by reading the entire passage in the original and not by attempting to translate word for word; after the author's meaning has

been found out, then the translation becomes merely an exercise in English. Such an exercise, requiring, as it does, use of judgment and taste in the selection of words, the adaptation of idioms, the proper apportionment of subordinate and coordinate ideas and the correct appreciation of rhetorical values, furnishes a valuable adjunct to the study of the vernacular which instructors in English cannot afford to underestimate. The famous Committee of Ten in its conference report on English made the following important recommendation:

It is the opinion of the conference that the best results in the teaching of English cannot be secured without the aid given by the study of some other language, and that Latin and German by reason of their fuller inflectional system are especially suited to this end.

We stand in great danger at the present time of becoming hopeless victims of delusions based upon certain exaggerated notions regarding the actual progress which we are making in our modern life. Both inside and outside of School and College, all too frequently do we have dinned into our ears that this thing is 'modern' or that procedure is 'up to date'. The present atmosphere, very unfortunately, causes us to be permeated with the idea that, in order to be considered modern, we must cut loose from our ancient moorings and regard ourselves as originating most that is wholesome in our present-day life. This feeling may not be surprising in the case of those who are so deeply engrossed in the transaction of every day affairs that they must depend largely upon the daily press for their information and ideas, but that students and even instructors, whose business it is to think and investigate, should yield to this popular fallacy, is not far short of ridiculous.

The average school boy and, only too often, many a student in college whose study of the Classics has not been prosecuted with sympathy and sense, but in a purely mechanical way, in his retrospective imagination makes the ancient Greek and the ancient Roman a strange creature, indeed. He often pictures him as devoid of flesh and blood and purely an intellectual product of the constructive historian. The student of history and of civilization who in his investigations is obliged to go below the mere superficial aspect of things is amazed at finding out how vast is our indebtedness to the nations of antiquity—particularly to the Greeks and the Romans—not alone for vital and commanding factors entering into our modern life, but for many of the smaller details affecting our daily existence. He discovers that many conveniences and luxuries as well as much of the refinement and culture of which we so proudly boast and which we often narrowly, if not ignorantly, ascribe to modern cleverness were enjoyed and appreciated in the individual and the national life of the classical nations. He finds out that these nations in their private and public affairs entered into the

burdens and pleasures of a civilization as complex and complete as our own, and that in the civic, economic, religious and social aspect of their life they were confronted, in the main, with all of the questions and issues with which we have to deal in the twentieth century. The query often arises in my mind as to whether or not many of our leading educators, and a host of minor ones, are really sincere and sensible when they urge with great insistence that the ancient languages are 'dead', while French and German, algebra and geometry, chemistry and physics are intensely practical. Now, can any one possibly claim that French or German is of any practical use to the American boy in the general acceptance of the term *practical*? Do we acquire any conversational fluency in either of these languages after four or more years of study? And even if we did, in our strictly English environment what purpose would be served by this ability to converse? Must we not with candor admit that the argument for the study of these languages is but an extension of the defense for the study of Latin and Greek? that is, in order that we may be brought into touch with many of the masterpieces of the world's literature whose content and beauty are inseparable from their linguistic dress and that we may broaden our sympathy by coming into contact with those phases of modern civilization which have taken a different turn from our own? May we also ask, for the purpose of enlightenment, whether any student, unless his life's work is along technical or professional lines requiring a minute knowledge of these subjects, receives any more direct practical advantage from the study of algebra and geometry, chemistry and physics than from the Classics? Do we not in the storm and stress of life forget *as such* every theorem in algebra, every proposition in geometry, every law of chemistry and physics as readily as we do the gerundive construction or the intricacies of Greek syntax?

As a matter of fact not one of the subjects included in the above list is practical in the sense in which the term is employed by the utilitarians. Not one, except in the case of the specialist, may be used directly in earning a living. But they all with the possible exception of algebra play a decidedly conspicuous part in the development of *power, initiative, efficiency, culture and character*, which after all should be the true aim of liberal education in our Schools and Colleges.

The present outlook with regard to the study of the Classics, while not especially encouraging, is nevertheless not without hope. Latin is holding its own in the Secondary Schools of the country. The latest available statistics from the National Bureau of education show that during the year 1910-1911 there were 9,378 High Schools, public and private, with an enrollment of 817,653 pupils. The number studying Latin was 405,502 or 49.59 per cent. The number studying Greek was but a fraction of 1 per cent. In the Colleges, where less than half a century ago

practically all of the students pursued the study of Latin and Greek for at least two years, there has been a decided decrease in the percentage of students taking those languages. This has been due largely to the free elective and the group systems, the former of which has been entirely abandoned by the Colleges and the Universities.

It is not the purpose of this paper to exalt unduly the function of Latin and Greek in the liberal training of American youth, nor to underrate the educational value of the many other subjects vitally necessary for the equipment of efficient citizens and capable leaders in the world's movements, but to register a protest against the undue emphasis placed upon these so-called practical subjects at the expense of the classical languages.

GEORGE M. LIGHTFOOT.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, Washington, D. C.

REVIEWS

The Science of Etymology. By Walter W. Skeat. Oxford: the Clarendon Press (1912). Pp. xviii + 242. \$1.50.

Not a few students of linguistic science have to thank the popular essays of Whitney and Max Müller for their first interest in comparative grammar, and many educated men still owe to these great masters whatever knowledge they possess of the life and the growth of language. One serious need of our day is a book at once sound enough and readable enough to perform a like service.

The title, the preface, and the opening paragraphs of Professor Skeat's latest book will arouse in many a reader the hope that at last the lack is to be supplied. All such will share the disappointment which the reviewer felt when he learned (page 35) that the "great purpose" of the work is to serve as a key to the author's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language! Even so the first ninety pages may be read with pleasure and profit by anyone who cares to know some of the guiding principles of modern etymology.

The latter part of the book purports to compare the English vocabulary with that of each of the main branches of the Indo-European family, except—curiously enough—Greek and Italic. As a matter of fact, however, we get little else than materials upon which such a comparison might be based. For whom they are intended is not clear: the general reader will not be greatly enlightened by lists of related words and scholars will prefer to make their own collections rather than rely upon an author who trusts Miklosich for his Slavic, and has apparently made no use of Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

Agamemnon of Aeschylus, with Verse Translation, Introduction and Notes, by Walter Headlam. Edited by A. C. Pearson. Cambridge: at the University Press (1910). Pp. xii + 266.

We are often told of the gradual evolution of justice, and the institution of punishment, from a proceeding that is essentially an act of vengeance to something designed to reform the evil-doer and deter others from following his example. In reading reviews one often wonders which attitude the critic-judge has assumed. But when the author of the work under discussion has passed away, his critic may at least abandon all hope of working a reform. Echo will not go to the black-walled abode of Persephone, as Pindar invoked her to do with his message to Kleodamos. It may even be seriously doubted whether the next producer of a work on a similar subject, be he the same author or not, will be discernibly affected by a reviewer's strictures, and if the law of *πάθει μάθος* seems not to prevail in philology, author and critic must suffer alike from the *ψεύδος ἐν τῷ ψυχῷ*.

Dr. Headlam's Agamemnon possesses the melancholy interest that always attaches to a posthumous work. Mr. Pearson tells us in the Editor's Preface that Dr. Headlam had been at work for some years on the edition, to his untimely death in 1908. The material left behind proved to be abundant, but in very different stages of completion; "whereas the Introduction and Verse Translation were nearly complete, and had undergone considerable revision at the hands of their author, the recension of the text had not been carried through, there were no critical notes, and the Commentary only existed in fragments". Still, there were available abundant annotations made by Headlam during his twenty years' exhaustive study of Aeschylus¹, and these have been utilized by the editor, who warns the reader that Headlam "was a severe critic of his own productions, and finality was not easily reached". The text as here printed is the result of minute examination of Headlam's own copy of Wecklein's edition of 1885, in which he had noted such textual corrections as he considered certain. Mr. Pearson has performed his difficult task with judgment and skill, and the result is a valuable addition to our resources for the interpretation of this play, which may be called on the whole the most difficult of all that have come down to us. The printing and make-up of the book leave little to be desired. Both the Greek and the English type of the Notes, though very clear and sharp, are, however, a little too small for comfort to the aging eye. Misprints seem to be very few.

As the Introduction and Translation represent most nearly the finished work of the author it seems best to speak of them most fully. The Introduction comprises the following discussions: The Story; The Drama; Remarks on the Story; Moral and Religious Ideas; the Characters. It abounds in suggestions of importance for the understanding of the play, as for example when Headlam writes (pp. 31 f.): "The guilt of Atreus propagated itself afresh in the guilt

of Agamemnon. It is the poet's cue, so to speak, to exhibit the personal culpability of the latter. This is why, in the forefront of his drama, he lays so much emphasis on the sacrifice of Iphigenia. . . . Agamemnon might have broken up his armament and left Troy to divine vengeance; and the poet several times hints that this would have been the proper course to adopt. But the fatal taint was in his blood, and when the temptation to iniquity came, he fell. From that moment his personal responsibility began. It was increased by his conjugal infidelities in regard to Chryseis and Cassandra, and by the bloodthirsty character of his vengeance upon Troy". In other words, while in all this there is no moral justification for Clytemnestra's crime, the poet was too good a playwright to fail to see that herein lay an important dramatic justification of her deed.

Headlam discusses at some length the theory constructed by Verrall to account for the extraordinary situation which has been such a puzzle to students of the play: the apparent impossibility of Agamemnon's arrival at Argos immediately after the fire-signal from Arachnaion has announced the taking of Troy. Verrall's explanation, hardly less marvellous than the situation, has naturally found little favor, and Headlam's refutation should make an end of it forever. To the present reviewer, however, Headlam himself seems to be in error on several points. Accepting as probable Blomfield's suggestion that the Chorus leaves the theatre for a short time after verse 493 (487), he assumes an interval in the action of the play "lasting several days" (p. 81). But there is no metrical indication, anapaestic or lyric, of the departure or re-entrance of the Chorus. The exit would be excessively awkward to manage, and would practically divide the piece into two almost distinct plays, the first of which would be but a fragment (the examples of such disappearance and return given by Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, 305, are of an entirely different character, and involve a change of scene). The assumption of an interval of "several days" does not help us much; for under the most favorable conditions Agamemnon's return from Troy would take several weeks. Again, in verse 592 (587) *τάλας* is explained as indicating a considerable interval of time since the sight of the beacon-fire on Arachnaion; but too much should not be made of this, as *τάλας* is idiomatically used in abrupt exclamations under stress of emotion, as e.g. in Sophocles, O.T. 1161, where it is of course to be construed with *είρω*.

A further difficulty in Verrall's theory seems to have escaped notice. The nearest high point of Arachnaion (a long ridge) is some ten miles distant from Argos. There is no indication in the play that Agamemnon's sole surviving ship has landed elsewhere than at the natural termination of a voyage for a person returning to Argos, i.e. at Nauplia or some point on the shore of its great sheltered bay—in any case, a spot within some four miles of Argos,

¹ The lively controversy with Dr. Verrall (begun, at least, with almost the true *furor Teutonicus*) in 1891-1892, will be remembered by students of Aeschylus.

with only smooth country intervening. Between such a point and Arachnaion, about as far away from here as from Argos, the country is very broken and irregular, with hills that cut off the view of Arachnaion. It is hardly to be supposed that Aeschylus would have thought of Clytemnestra as expecting news of Agamemnon's arrival to be signalled to her first from Arachnaion, or as expecting the elders to believe that she had first received the news from that quarter if her story were made out of whole cloth. His careful calculation of possibilities is evident from his marvellously vivid description of the chain of fire-signals with its successive links. The accuracy of the poet's geographical knowledge was well shown by the late Professor A. C. Merriam, in his excellent paper, *Telegraphing among the Ancients* (Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, Series III, 1:1890), a paper which has not, apparently, received the attention it deserves. Hans Fischl, for example, who in 1904 published a useful *Programm* under the title *Fernsprech- und Meldewesen im Altertum* (Schweinfurt), seems not to have heard of it. When Headlam says (p. 12), "For what remains, that the distances are too great, the poet himself has frankly acknowledged as much in the first word of the description" (vers. 293), he not only ignores Merriam's proofs that the distances were not too great for successful signalling, but entirely misinterprets the line.

The Verse Translation, on which a great deal of labor was evidently bestowed, is of very uneven merit. Headlam was under no illusions regarding the difficulty of the task, as is shown by the extract (p. x) from a personal letter written by him in 1903. It is not given to many men to write verse that is even approximately worthy to stand face to face with Aeschylus's sonorous and magnificent lines. If a translation must stand opposite the Greek text it had better be a fairly literal one, in prose, such for example as Headlam's own, published in 1904. Jebb's instinct was surer in these matters. The metrical version, to be good poetry in its own language, must often diverge widely from the original. The translator into verse must meet the requirement that he be a good poet as well as a competent interpreter; it is far more merciful to him to print his rendering away from the original.

It would be inappropriate here to enter upon a detailed discussion of the Notes, which were, as the editor reminds us, left in a very incomplete state. Not infrequently passages of considerable difficulty are left without commentary, doubtless because Dr. Headlam had not reached any definite conclusions about them; but many passages have received elaborate treatment, and probably would have been little altered in a final revision. There is abundance of literary illustration, which Dr. Headlam, by his very wide reading, was peculiarly well fitted to give; and everywhere an independence of view which makes the commentary always interesting. An example of

his ingenuity of interpretation may be seen in the note on verses 566-567 (561-562), where he inserts a comma after *σινος*, removes that commonly placed after *δοθημάτων*, and translates

dews with damage dripped
Abiding, that our woolly garments made
All verminous [*ἐσθηπτον*].—

which reminds one of the shocking deaths of Alcman and Pherecydes, as reported by Aristotle, *Hist. An.* 5.31. Yet Headlam admits that Sophocles probably understood the passage as is done by most modern interpreters, taking *τρίχα* as 'hair of the head', and imitating it in *Ajax* 1206 f.

The book lacks all discussion of the lyric metres of the play—a deficiency the more to be regretted as Headlam's arrangement of the verses in lyric passages often shows considerable variations from the accepted divisions.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. D. PERRY.

For some years Dr. Bernadotte Perrin, Lampson Professor (Emeritus) of Greek Literature and History in Yale University, has been translating Plutarch afresh. Prior to 1912 two volumes of this translation had appeared, giving respectively renderings of Themistocles and Aristides, and of Cimon and Pericles. Last year a third volume was published (Charles Scribner's Sons: \$2.00 net), giving a translation of the Nicias and the Alcibiades. In an Introduction of 51 pages Professor Perrin deals with *Primary Sources for Greek History During the Peloponnesian War* (1-12); *Chronological Table of Events in the Lives of Nicias and Alcibiades* (12-29); *The Sources of Plutarch in his Nicias, with an Analysis of this Life* (29-39); *The Sources of Plutarch in his Alcibiades, with an Analysis of this Life* (39-51). The translation of the Nicias occupies pages 55-107, that of the Alcibiades 111-168. Then follow notes on the Nicias (171-263), and Notes on the Alcibiades (257-328). These notes deal occasionally with matters of text, but as a rule are intended to explain matters mentioned by Plutarch, in a word to throw light on the subject-matter of these two Lives. As stated in the preface (xi), much comment takes the form of citations from Thucydides, Xenophon, and Pausanias; these have been made in the standard translations of Jowett, Dakyns, and Frazer (though at times Professor gives, besides these versions, a corrected rendering of his own). To other Greek authors also many references are made. By these citations Plutarch's statements are supported, expanded or corrected as may be necessary, and the value of the work as a whole is very greatly increased. Of the merits of the translation there is no longer need to speak: the reception accorded to the earlier volumes (1901, 1910) is proof enough of those merits. It remains to notice that the first volume contained two essays of importance to lovers of Greek literature: *Plutarch the Biographer*, and *Biography before Plutarch*. In connection with these one would do well to read Professor Perrin's fine paper on *The Ethics and Amenities of Greek Historiography*, read by him as President's address at the 28th Annual Session of the American Philological Association, held at Bryn Mawr, July 6, 1897, and printed in *The American Journal of Philology* 18. 255-274.

C. K.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 119th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GENERALRE LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editor

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

JUST PUBLISHED

**Problems in
Periclean Buildings**

By G. W. ELDERKIN

Preceptor in Art and Archaeology in Princeton University

This is the second volume to appear in the series of Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology.

Quarto, 66 pp.; Cloth, \$1.75 net. By mail, \$1.87

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton, N. J.

The Back Volumes of
THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

MAY BE SECURED
BY WRITING TO

Professor Charles Knapp

Barnard College, NEW YORK CITY

A Limited Number of Sets remains.
Price \$1.00 Per Volume.

**PAXSON'S TWO LATIN PLAYS:
A Roman School and a Roman Wedding**

make the high-school pupils
realize the beauty and force of
Latin as a spoken language.

GINN AND COMPANY
70 Fifth Avenue NEW YORK

**BARSS'S THIRD YEAR LATIN
FOR SIGHT READING**

40 cents

Selections from Sallust—Catiline and Jugurtha, and Cicero—Catiline II and IV, Verres, Roscius, De Senectute, and Letters. Special sight reading foot notes and chapters on How to Read at Sight and the Use of Word Formation in Reading.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

A SUPERB NEW TEXT
CICERO'S ORATIONS

Edited by
Walter B. Gunnison, Ph.D., Principal, and Walter S. Harley, A.M., Instructor in Latin, Erasmus Hall High School.

This is the most complete, most richly illustrated edition of Cicero ever published for school use. Many of its illustrations have never before appeared in a school text. It contains the required orations; a Grammatical Appendix; Prose Composition and Sight Reading Selections. 543 pp. \$1.25.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
231 West 39th Street NEW YORK CITY

The Library of every Latin teacher

SHOULD INCLUDE

- JOHNSTON'S *Private Life of the Romans* . . . \$1.50
cloth 8vo. 304 pages
- " *Latin Manuscripts* 2.25
cloth 4to. 136 pages
16 facsimile plates
- " *Metrical Licenses of Vergil*50
paper 4to. 54 pages

Copies will be billed "on approval" to teachers and special terms given when the order is for the complete set.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
37 East 20th St., New York